

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

EDWIN LEROY SHEPPARD,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:07-cv-132  
HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

JEFF WHITE,

Respondent.

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Petitioner Edwin Leroy Sheppard filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the validity of his conviction for unarmed robbery. Petitioner was sentenced as a fourth habitual offender to 9 ½ to 20 years imprisonment. Petitioner maintains that his convictions were obtained in violation of his federal rights. The respondent has filed an answer and has complied with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. The parties have briefed the issues and the matter is now ready for decision. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), authorizing United States Magistrate Judges to submit proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition of prisoner petitions, I am recommending that this petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied.

Petitioner claims that:

I. Petitioner's Sixth Amendment right to an impartial jury was violated by the struck jury method of jury selection utilized by the trial court.

II. Petitioner's Fifth Amendment right against self incrimination was violated when the prosecutor solicited comment on his post arrest silence from the arresting officer and utilized same in his closing argument.

III. Petitioner's Sixth Amendment right to counsel and counsel of choice at arraignment were violated when the trial court refused to allow substitution of appointed counsel with retained counsel of choice until petitioner paid \$375.00 in pre-judgment appointed attorney fees, resulting in the complete absence of counsel at arraignment.

IV. Petitioner was deprived of his Sixth Amendment rights to the effective assistance of trial and appellate counsel, which also constituted cause for any perceived procedural default.

In April of 1996, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) became effective. Because this petition was filed after the effective date of the AEDPA, this Court must follow the standard of review established in that statute. Pursuant to the AEDPA, an application for writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person who is incarcerated pursuant to a state conviction cannot be granted with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in state court unless the adjudication: "(1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; or (2) resulted in a decision that was based upon an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

The AEDPA limits the source of law to cases decided by the United States Supreme Court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). This provision marks a "significant change" and prevents the district court from looking to lower federal court decisions in determining whether the state decision is contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law. *Herbert v. Billy*, 160 F.3d 1131, 1134 (6th Cir. 1998). To justify a grant of habeas corpus relief under this provision of the AEDPA, a federal court must find a violation of law "clearly established" by holdings of the Supreme Court, as opposed to its dicta, as of the time of the relevant state court decision. *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 412 (2000). Recently, the Supreme Court held that a decision of the state

court is “contrary to” such clearly established federal law “if the state court arrives at a conclusion opposite to that reached by this Court on a question of law or if the state court decides a case differently than this Court has on a set of materially indistinguishable facts.” *Id.* A state court decision will be deemed an “unreasonable application” of clearly established federal law “if the state court identifies the correct governing legal principle from this Court’s decisions but unreasonably applies that principle to the facts of the prisoner’s case.” *Id.* A federal habeas court may not find a state adjudication to be “unreasonable” “simply because that court concludes in its independent judgment that the relevant state-court decision applied clearly established federal law erroneously or incorrectly.” *Id.* at 412. Rather, the application must also be “unreasonable.” *Id.* Further, the habeas court should not transform the inquiry into a subjective one by inquiring whether all reasonable jurists would agree that the application by the state court was unreasonable. *Id.* at 410 (disavowing *Drinkard v. Johnson*, 97 F.3d 751, 769 (5th Cir. 1996)). Rather, the issue is whether the state court’s application of clearly established federal law is “objectively unreasonable.” *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 409.

The AEDPA requires heightened respect for state factual findings. *Herbert v. Billy*, 160 F.3d 1131, 1134 (6th Cir. 1998). The habeas corpus statute has long provided that the factual findings of the state courts, made after a hearing, are entitled to a presumption of correctness. This presumption has always been accorded to findings of state appellate courts, as well as the trial court. *See Sumner v. Mata*, 449 U.S. 539, 546 (1981); *Smith v. Jago*, 888 F.2d 399, 407 n.4 (6th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 495 U.S. 961 (1990). Under the AEDPA, a determination of a factual issue made by a state court is presumed to be correct. The petitioner has the burden of rebutting the presumption of correctness by clear and convincing evidence. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1); *see also Warren v. Smith*, 161 F.3d 358, 360-61 (6th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 527 U.S. 1040 (1999).

Petitioner claims that he was denied his Sixth Amendment right to an impartial jury because the trial court used the struck method of jury selection. The Michigan Court of Appeals noted that although the method was improper under Michigan court rules, M.C.R. 2.511(F), petitioner did not object during trial, expressed satisfaction in the jury selection process and petitioner failed to show any violation of his Due Process rights resulting from the selection method. Petitioner simply asserts that the method of jury selection was improper. Petitioner has not shown that he failed to receive an impartial jury or that any particular juror should not have been seated. Moreover, a federal court may not issue a writ of habeas corpus on the basis of a perceived error of state law. *Pulley v. Harris*, 465 U.S. 37, 41 (1984); *Engle v. Isaac*, 456 U.S. 107, 119 (1982); *Smith v. Sowders*, 848 F.2d 735, 738 (6th Cir. 1988), *cert. denied* 488 U.S. 866 (1988). Therefore, it appears that this portion of petitioner's argument should be dismissed.<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner claims that the prosecutor solicited post arrest silence from a witness in violation of the Fifth Amendment and improperly commented on the silence during closing argument. Petitioner's argument is factually incorrect. The question that was asked involved issues "prior to putting [petitioner] under arrest." Further, the prosecutor never commented on post arrest silence during closing argument. Petitioner asserts that he never actually spoke with the officer until after he was arrested. Even if that was true, the officer did not testify about petitioner's post arrest silence.

Both the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court denied petitioner relief on this issue under M.C.R. 6.508(D). Under M.C.R. 6.508(D)(2) and (3), a

---

<sup>1</sup>Alternatively, to the extent that petitioner has attempted to raise this claim under federal law, petitioner clearly procedurally defaulted this issue by not objecting at trial. Petitioner's attempt to establish cause by a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, in the opinion of the undersigned, lacks merit, because petitioner cannot show that counsel was ineffective on this issue.

defendant may not collaterally attack a conviction based upon claims that were decided against him in a prior appeal or that could have been raised on direct appeal. For claims that could have been raised, the defendant is entitled to relief only if he can establish “good cause” for failing to raise the grounds on appeal and “actual prejudice,” as shown by a “reasonably likely chance of acquittal” or an “irregularity so offensive to the maintenance of a sound judicial process that the conviction should not be allowed to stand.” M.C.R. 6.508(D)(3)(a)-(b). In assessing how “firmly” a state procedural rule has been established, the critical inquiry is whether, viewed from the time of the petitioner’s later significant actions or inaction, the petitioner could be deemed to have been apprised of the procedural rule’s existence. *Luberda v. Trippett*, 211 F.3d 1104, 1006-1007 (6th Cir. 2000). Because M.C.R. 6.508(D) was enacted in 1989 and petitioner’s conviction and appeals took place some time thereafter, M.C.R. 6.508(D) was a “firmly established” procedural rule for purposes of petitioner’s action. *See Luberda*, 211 F.3d at 1007; *Rogers v. Howes*, 144 F.3d 990, 994 (6th Cir. 1998). Petitioner asserts that ineffective assistance of counsel constitutes cause for his procedural default. In the opinion of the undersigned, counsel was not ineffective for failing to place an objection on the record regarding this issue. The comments were isolated. Moreover, contrary to petitioner’s claims, the comments were not regarding post arrest silence.

Similarly, petitioner procedurally defaulted his claim that he was denied counsel of choice at his arraignment until he paid \$375.00 in court appointed attorney fees. Petitioner first raised this claim on appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court and never raised this issue in his motion for relief from judgment. Moreover, contrary to petitioner’s assertion, he was represented by effective assistance of counsel at each critical stage in the criminal proceeding.

Petitioner claims that he was denied effective assistance of trial and appellate counsel. Petitioner claims that his trial counsel should have objected to the struck jury method of jury

selection and should have objected to the prosecutor's solicitation of petitioner's post arrest silence and the prosecutor's comments during closing argument. Petitioner claims that appellate counsel should have raised issues that were not presented on direct appeal.

In order to prevail on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, petitioner must show that counsel's errors were so serious that he was not functioning as counsel guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment, and that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. *Wong v. Money*, 142 F.3d 313, 319 (6th Cir. 1998); *Bruner v. Perini*, 875 F.2d 531, 535 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 938, 110 S. Ct. 334 (1989) (citing *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 688-96, 104 S. Ct. 2052, 2065, 69, 80 L. Ed. 2d 647 (1984)).

There has been ineffective assistance of counsel where an attorney's performance is so deficient as to prejudice the defense and render the trial unfair and the result unreliable. *Wong*, 142 F.3d at 319; *Austin v. Bell*, 126 F.3d 843, 847 (6th Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 118 S. Ct. 1547 (1998). Even if a court determines that counsel's performance was outside the wide range of professionally competent assistance, the petitioner is not entitled to relief if his counsel's error had no effect on the judgment. *Tucker v. Prelesnik*, 181 F.3d 747, 754 (6th Cir. 1999). Rather, a petitioner must show that the probability that the outcome of the case would have been different but for counsel's unprofessional errors is sufficient to undermine confidence in the result. *Wong*, 142 F.3d at 319; *Austin*, 126 F.2d at 848. "The performance and prejudice components of the *Strickland* test are mixed questions of law and fact." *Austin*, 126 F.2d at 848.

The court's review of defense counsel's performance is highly deferential, and defense counsel is presumed to have rendered adequate assistance by exercising reasonable professional judgment and sound trial strategy. *Wong*, 142 F.3d at 319; *Austin*, 126 F.3d at 848. The

petitioner must overcome the presumption that, under the circumstances, the challenged actions might be considered sound trial strategy. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 689; *Tucker v. Prelesnik*, 181 F.3d 747, 754 (6th Cir. 1999). In the opinion of the undersigned, petitioner has not overcome the presumption that his trial and appellate counsels acted appropriately. Petitioner has not shown that his Sixth Amendment or Fifth Amendment rights were violated or that appellate counsel failed to present any issue with merit on appeal.

In summary, the undersigned concludes that petitioner's claims are without merit and therefore recommends that this Court dismiss the petition with prejudice.

In addition, if Petitioner should choose to appeal this action, I recommend that a certificate of appealability be denied as to each issue raised by the Petitioner in this application for habeas corpus relief. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a "substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. 2001). Rather, the district court must "engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim" to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000). *Murphy*, 263 F.3d at 467. Consequently, the undersigned has examined each of Petitioner's claims under the *Slack* standard.

Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, to warrant a grant of the certificate, "[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." The undersigned concludes that reasonable jurists could

not find that a dismissal of each of Petitioner's claims was debatable or wrong. Therefore, the undersigned recommends that the court deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

NOTICE TO PARTIES: Objections to this Report and Recommendation must be served on opposing parties and filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten (10) days of receipt of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of any further right to appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). *See also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

/s/ Timothy P. Greeley  
TIMOTHY P. GREELEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: December 23, 2009